ORIGINA'.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

2021 M A 21 PM 2: 15

PAUL SULLIVAN,	\$ 3-21CV0915-8
Plaintiff,	§ Cause No.:
v.	§ §
CITY OF DALLAS, TEXAS,	§ JURY DEMAND §
Defendant.	§ §

# **PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

# TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Plaintiff, Paul Sullivan, brings this action against Defendant City of Dallas, to redress certain grievance arising under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Family Medical Leave Act, the American with Disabilities Act, and Texas common law. For causes of action, Plaintiff would show this Court as follows:

#### I. PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Paul Sullivan, is a citizen and resident of Dallas County, Texas.
- 2. Defendant, The City of Dallas, is a municipality/political subdivision in Dallas County and may be served by delivering citation to T.C. Broadnax, Dallas City Hall, 1500 Marilla Street, Dallas, TX 75201.

#### II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3), The Family Medical Leave Act, The American with Disabilities Act (1990 as amended), 29 U.S.C. § 621, et seq., and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 1334 and the State of Texas common law under concurrent jurisdiction.

- 4. Venue in this district is proper under Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3), The Family Medical Leave Act, The American with Disabilities Act (1990 as amended), and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
- 5. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b), The Family Medical Leave Act, The American with Disabilities Act (1990 as amended), and 29 U.S.C. § 630(b).
- 6. Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) within 300 days of Defendant's discriminatory conduct.
- 7. Plaintiff received a Notice of Right to Sue from the EEOC on or around January 21, 2021, relating to his Title VII claims and brings this lawsuit within ninety (90) days.
  - 8. Based on the foregoing, all jurisdictional prerequisites to this suit have been met.

# III. FACTS

- 9. At all times relevant to this case, Plaintiff was an employee of the City of Dallas as defined in Texas law, Title VII, ADA, and FMLA.
- 10. At all times relevant to this case, Defendant has been an "employer" within the meaning of Texas law, Title VII, ADA, and FMLA.
- 11. Plaintiff had worked for Defendant faithfully for approximately 20 years starting in 1999 in numerous roles ranging from the Municipal Court to Information Technology.
- 12. In 2015, Plaintiff began working for The City of Dallas Public Works Department primarily working in the area of streets.
- 13. In 2018, Plaintiff was involved and participating in a team of workers who make projections for repairs of City of Dallas street repairs for a five (5) year period.

- 14. After significant efforts and resources, the City of Dallas Public Works team, including Plaintiff, determined that the budget over the next five (5) years for street repairs should be approximately \$1.3 billion.
- 15. After this determination, on or about January 2018, City of Dallas Public Works hired a third party private pavement management consulting firm, named Fugro, to conduct the same exact work completed internally by City of Dallas Public Works Department, namely estimating a budget for street repairs for a five (5) year period. Fugro estimated street repair budget of \$1.8 billion for five (5) years in contrast to the \$1.3 billion over the same five (5) year period estimated internally by the City of Dallas Public Works Department.
- 16. Plaintiff began stating that this was a fraudulent means of obtaining an additional half billion dollars to the Public Works budget from June 18, 2018 thru March 2019, through emails and verbally on or at least ten (10) occasions with his director supervisors namely, Jennifer Nicewander, Manager of Pavement Management Project and Robert Perez, Director of Public Works.
- 17. In August 2018, the Public Works Department of City of Dallas presented Fugro's findings and was approved for the full \$1.8 billion in September 2018.
- 18. From December 2018 thru March 2019, Jennifer Nicewander, Manager of Pavement Management Project and Robert Perez, Director of Public Works engaged in efforts to suppress information on Plaintiff's performance evaluation.
- 19. On or about March 5, 2019, Plaintiff sent a letter to Robert Perez, Jennifer Nicewander, and Cosmin Spiridon reporting race discrimination under Title VII race discrimination and informing them of an imminent filing of an EEOC complaint.

- 20. Two days later, on or about March 7, 2019, Plaintiff was issued a Letter of Counseling two days later in retaliation for reporting race discrimination.
- 21. On or about March 8, 2019, Plaintiff took information reflecting fraud and mishandling of City of Dallas funds to repair streets in the amount of \$300,000,000.00 over a five (5) year period to the Dallas City Council and the Federal Bureau Investigation.
- 22. On or about April 2, 2019, Jennifer Nicewander and Robert Perez placed Plaintiff on suspension due to his asserting his Title VII rights and for taking data regarding fraud in mishandling City of Dallas funds to the Dallas City Council and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- 23. From March 21, 2019 thru October 30, 2019, Will Walling (CIS/DBA Group Manager) directed his staff on multiple occasions not to work on any public works projects related to Paul Sullivan.
- 24. On or about August 7, 2019, Plaintiff submitted an FMLA request due to his ADA disability for leave between August 7<sup>th</sup> October 7<sup>th</sup> in 2019. This FMLA leave constituted a request for accommodation under the ADA.
- 25. Plaintiff is disabled by being HIV positive and is further regarded as disabled by The City of Dallas as he had reported the same to them and applied for FMLA leave based on his disability.
- 26. Plaintiff's HIV positive status also qualifies as a significant health condition under the FMLA.
- 27. On or about October 3, 2019, Defendant violated the ADA, FMLA, and Texas common law for terminating Plaintiff due to his request for accommodation due to his disability, in retaliation for his letter on March 5, 2019 reporting race discrimination under Title VII,

making an FMLA request for time off, and for reporting criminal waste of City of Dallas funds with respect to repair of streets to the FBI and City Council of Dallas.

28. Plaintiff suffered significant harm and damages as a consequence of Defendants actions.

# IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

#### COUNT ONE: ADA DISCRIMINATION

- 29. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-alleges everything contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.
  - 30. Defendant City of Dallas is an "employer" as defined by the ADA.
  - 31. Plaintiff Paul Sullivan is an "employee" as defined by the ADA.
  - 32. Plaintiff was qualified for his position at all times while working for Defendant.
- 33. Plaintiff was both disabled and regarded as disabled in light of his HIV positive status.
- 34. Plaintiff requested leave to deal with his disability on or about August 7, 2019 and was terminated shortly thereafter on or about October 3, 2019 for requesting this accommodation.
- 35. As a result of Defendant's violations of ADA, Plaintiff has suffered mental and emotional trauma, actual damages in the form of lost wages and benefits (past and future) and other losses.
- 36. As a result of these willful violations of the ADA, Plaintiff requests that he be awarded all compensatory damages, to which he is entitled, as outlined in Title VII, as well as equitable relief, and attorneys' fees and costs.

# **COUNT II: TITLE VII RETALIATION**

- 37. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-alleges everything contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.
  - 38. Defendant, City of Dallas is an "employer" as defined in the Title VII.
  - 39. Plaintiff, Paul Sullivan is an "employee" as defined by the Title VII.
- 40. On or about March 5, 2019, Plaintiff sent a letter reporting Title VII race discrimination and informing Defendants that he intended to file an EEOC complaint regarding the same.
- 41. Plaintiff was then retaliated against two days later on March 7, 2019 by being issued a Letter of Counseling by his direct manager Jennifer Nicewander, by Will Walling (CIS/DBA Group Manager) directing his staff on multiple occasions not to work on any public works projects related to Paul Sullivan, and ultimately by being terminated on or about October 3, 2019.
- 42. Defendant was aware of the protected activity and discriminated further against Plaintiff and terminated Plaintiff based on his engaging in protected activity.
- 43. Plaintiff suffered significant harm through this retaliation for asserting his Title VII rights.

# **COUNT III: FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE ACT VIOLATION**

- 44. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-alleges everything contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.
- 45. The FMLA specifically provides that it is unlawful for an employer to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against an employee for exercising the employee's right to take FMLA leave. 29 U.S.C. § 2615(a)(2).

- 46. Plaintiff is an employee within the meaning of the FMLA. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant for at least 12 months and worked at least 1,250 hours in the 12 months preceding the leave.
- 47. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of the FMLA. Defendant employed 50 or more employees for each working day of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year.
- 48. During the course of his employment, on or about August 7, 2019, Plaintiff applied for FMLA leave due to his significant health condition, namely being HIV positive to his employer, The City of Dallas from August 7, 2019 to October 7, 2019.
- 49. Shortly thereafter on or about October 3, 2019, Defendant unlawfully retaliated against Plaintiff for seeking leave under the FMLA. Specifically, Defendant terminated Plaintiff during his requested FMLA requested leave period.
- 50. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiff's exercise of rights under the FMLA and his subsequent termination, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer damages, including, but not limited to, lost wages, both past and future, and the value of benefits and fringe benefits.
- 51. Because Plaintiff was forced to retain counsel to protect his rights, Plaintiff is also entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and any other costs of court. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on all sums, including attorneys' fees and costs awarded in this action.

# COUNT IV: PUBLIC POLICY EXCEPTION TO AT-WILL EMPLOYMENT UNDER TEXAS COMMON LAW

52. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-alleges everything contained in the preceding paragraphs as if fully stated herein.

- 53. Plaintiff was involved in estimating repairs to streets in the City of Dallas for a five (5) year period which Plaintiff along with others in the Public Works department estimated to be \$1.3 billion.
- 54. The City of Dallas Public Works Department then hired a private consulting company named Fugro to complete the exact same work that was conducted internally.
- 55. Fugro estimated the cost to repair/maintain streets in the City of Dallas to be \$1.8 billion which allowed the Public Works department to be approved for an additional half billion dollars by the Dallas City Council.
- Public Works department had wasted money to engage Fugro to repeat the same analysis conducted internally in the City of Dallas for the sole purpose of justifying increased funds to Public Works.
- 57. Plaintiff further asserted that criminal and civil fraud had occurred to essentially take an additional half billion dollars from the City of Dallas budget without any reasonable justification.
- 58. Plaintiff, along with other public works employees, reported numerous times that Fugro's estimates were a gross overestimation of the funds necessary for street repairs and was a fraudulent allocation and use of City monies which ultimately was harmful to the City of Dallas and it's citizens.
- 59. On or about March 8, 2019, Plaintiff formally presented his data and conclusions regarding fraud to the Dallas City Council and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- 60. He was immediately retaliated against by Will Walling, a manager, directing his employees not to work with Plaintiff on any aspects of public works.

- 61. He was further retaliated against by the rejection of his FMLA request and ADA accommodation made on August 7, 2019 by being terminated on or about October 3, 2019.
- 62. Plaintiff took actions that were in the public interest even though it was detrimental to his position at the City of Dallas.
- 63. Plaintiff's actions were motivated by preventing a significant over-allocation of funds towards streets and prevent waste and fraud.
- 64. Plaintiff's actions were further motivated by his sincere and genuine belief, after analyzing the data, that the City of Dallas Public Works were involved in criminal fraud, hence his report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- 65. If the Federal Bureau of Investigation would determine that the City of Dallas Public Works had committed a crime of a fraud in the allocation of street funds, Plaintiff did not wish to participate in such a crime.
- 66. The City of Dallas retaliated against Plaintiff for expressing his unwillingness to participate in a potentially fraudulent crime as well as his unwillingness to be complicit in the allocation of City of Dallas funds on a false premise thereby attempting to protect the citizens of the City of Dallas.
- 67. Plaintiff was immediately retaliated against and then eventually terminated for his reports of fraud to the City of Dallas and his unwillingness to engage in said fraud.
- 68. Plaintiff's actions were honorable and done in the spirit of preventing a half a billion dollar fraud on the citizens of the City of Dallas.
- 69. Texas public policy is to protect and shield employees courageous enough to express dissent to potential fraud to avoid a chilling effect on whistleblowers by removing all protections on their jobs.

70. Plaintiff was severely damaged by the actions of the City of Dallas and continues to suffer such damages.

# V. DAMAGES

- 71. Each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs are re-alleged as if fully re-written herein, and incorporated by reference.
- 72. Defendant's violations of Title VII give rise to the following damages: back pay, reinstatement, or if reinstatement is deemed not feasible, compensation for lost future pay or front pay; benefits in the past and the future, liquidated damages; costs; expert witness fees; attorneys' fees; mental anguish; emotional distress in the past and future; compensatory damages; and pre- and post-judgment interest as allowed by law.

# VI. JURY DEMAND

73. Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury.

# VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 74. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays that Defendant City of Dallas be cited to appear and answer herein and that upon a final hearing of the cause, that judgment be entered for Plaintiff against Defendant, and that Plaintiff be awarded the following:
  - A. Declare that Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under Title VII;
  - B. Actual and compensatory damages for the period of time provided by law, including appropriate back pay, unpaid back wages at the applicable overtime rate; front pay and reimbursement (past and future) for lost pension, insurance and all other benefits;
  - C. Reinstatement, or front pay, including benefits, in lieu of reinstatement;
  - D. Compensatory damages as allowed by law

- E. Reasonable attorneys' fees, court costs and expenses of this action
- F. Expert witness fees incurred by Plaintiff in the preparation and prosecution of this action;
- G. Damages for emotional distress and mental anguish;
- H. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as allowed by law; and
- I. Such other and further relief as may be allowed by law or in equity.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Sullivan, Pro Se

(Drafted with Assistance of Counsel)

1900 Elm Street, Apt. 406

Dallas, TX 75201

bknamerican@gmail.com

(214) 715-7854

JS 44 (Rev. 10/20) - TXND (10/20	) :21-cv-00915-S-I	BN CIVIL C	OVE	RSHEET	Page 12 of 12	PanalD 16
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and provided by local rules of cour	the information contained	nerein neitner replace ne	or supplem of the Uni	nent the filing and service ted States in September 1	e of preadings or other paper 1974, is required for the use	rs as required by law, except as of the Clerk of Court for the
purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE (	OF THIS FO			
. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		
Paul Sullivan,				The City of Dalla	as	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant[	COENTER
•	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	
				NOTE: IN LAND CO	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE OF LAND INVOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF
(a) American (b) (c) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d				Attorneys (If Known) APR 2   2021		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				Audito's (1) Known		APR Z I ZOZI
Pro Se						<u>C</u>
			r			ERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Flaming and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government #3 Federal Question			PTF DEF PTF DEF			
Plaintiff	Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citize	en of This State	1 Incorporated or of Business In	
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citiza	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State		
Detondant	(Institute Cistorian	p 0, 1 a. 11.00 a. 110111 111/		_	3 Foreign Nation	☐ 6 ☐ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place on "X" in One Box O	nlv)	1	reign Country	Click here for: Nature of	Suit Code Descriptions.
CONTRACT		RTS	PC	XFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR	Y 🗀 62	25 Drug Related Seizure	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	H <sub>69</sub>	of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/	F"	-		400 State Reapportionment
150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical	ı		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
& Enforcement of Judgmen	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			830 Patent	450 Commerce
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Personal	ı		835 Patent - Abbreviated	460 Deportation
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability			New Drug Applicatio 840 Trademark	n 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPER		LABOR	880 Defend Trade Secrets	
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending	J-J71	0 Fair Labor Standards Act	Act of 2016	(15 USC 1681 or 1692) 485 Telephone Consumer
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	72	20 Labor/Management	CONTRACTOR OF THE	
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	Property Damage	F.,	Relations	861 HIA (1395ff)	490 Cable/Sat TV
196 Franchise	Injury  362 Personal Injury -	285 Property Damage Product Liability		0 Railway Labor Act	862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
	Medical Malpractice			Leave Act	864 SSID Title XVI	890 Other Statutory Actions
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:		O Other Labor Litigation I Employee Retirement	865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee	一尸"	Income Security Act	100 CON (100	895 Freedom of Information
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate	•		870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General			or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure
290 All Other Real Property	# 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Bread .		IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth		<ul><li>52 Naturalization Application</li><li>55 Other Immigration</li></ul>	<b>l</b>	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of
	Other	550 Civil Rights		Actions		State Statutes
	448 Education	555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -				
		Conditions of	ŀ			
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	in One Roy Only)	Confinement				
	•••	Remanded from	⊣4 Rein	stated or 🗂 5 Transfe	erred from 6 Multidis	
	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reop	pened Anothe (specifi		
		itute under which you a tle VII. and Commo		Do not cite jurisdictional sta	tutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of c		UII LAW			
		nation and Retaliation	on			
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: Yes No						
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S)					
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		· · ·				
RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. J	UDGE